

Studies in Classical Armenian Literature

Edited by
JOHN A. C. GREPPIN
Cleveland State University



CARAVAN BOOKS
DELMAR, NEW YORK
1994

The Zohrab Bible

CLAUDE COX

Zohrabian's edition of the Bible, printed in 1805, is in a sense one of the achievements of the Renaissance.¹ The Renaissance set in motion a broad inquiry into the foundations of modern civilization. This inquiry involved an interest in ancient cultures and their languages which, in turn, led to the study of and printing of the Bible in its original languages, Hebrew and Greek. At the same time scholars turned their attention to the versions into which the Scriptures had been translated, studying the ancient languages and preparing editions of the Bible in Arabic, Ethiopic, Latin, Coptic, Armenian, and Georgian.

In 1805 the field of biblical studies was just nicely entering the age of scientific, critical inquiry. About this time notable advances were being made in the areas of archeology, literary and source criticism, and textual criticism.² In the area of archeology the ancient Near East had surrendered practically none of its treasures by 1805. In 1798 Napoleon took one hundred artists and scholars to Egypt but they could not read any of the inscriptions which they saw. By 1802 work had begun on the decipherment of hieroglyphics but it was not until twenty years later that Champollion succeeded in being able to read them.³ The birth of Assyriology dates from approximately the same time, namely, from the memoirs of Claudius James Rich (d. 1821) concerning the ruins of the city of Babylon.⁴ The first fragments of the so-called "Babylonian Genesis" were found in excavations at Nineveh between 1848 and 1876 and published by Smith in 1876.⁵ While Zohrabian was working on his edition of the Bible the study of the archeology of the biblical world had just begun.

The study of the Bible itself was more advanced and there was considerable activity in Europe in the areas of literary and textual criticism. At the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries there was vigorous inquiry into the sources that lie behind the various biblical documents. This inquiry was directed particularly at the Synoptic Gospels and the Pentateuch. Lessing's publication of the sensational *Wölffenbüttel Fragments* (1774-78) revealed variations among the Gos-

pels' narratives. A quarter of a century later J. G. Eichhorn took up these questions in his *Introduction to the New Testament* (1804-27; in German) and gave form to Lessing's suggestions in asserting a primitive Aramaic gospel. Aside from this issue of original sources, scholars were trying to determine which of the three Synoptic Gospels had been written first: the "Griesbach hypothesis" in 1789 had suggested the sequence Matthew-Luke-Mark. The assertion of Marcan priority was advocated already at the end of the eighteenth century and has gained widespread support in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁶

While New Testament scholars were dissecting the Gospels and inquiring into the sources behind them, Old Testament scholars were doing much the same with the Pentateuch. In 1753 Jean Astruc identified two sources in the Pentateuch based on the two different names for God employed in Genesis. The first documentary theory of the Hexateuch's composition is to be found in J. G. Eichhorn, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1780-83; in German).⁷ In the same year that Zohrabian's Bible was published W. M. L. DeWette, in his doctoral dissertation, identified the book of the law found by King Josiah at the end of the seventh century B.C. with the book of Deuteronomy.⁸ This identification would prove to be as significant for Old Testament studies as the assertion of Marcan priority among the Synoptic Gospels in New Testament studies because it gave to scholars a fixed date around which the various Pentateuchal sources and other Old Testament documents could be ranged. DeWette was also responsible for one of the earliest successful biblical theologies, *Biblical Doctrines of the Old Testament and New Testament* (in German), which appeared in two volumes in 1813 and 1816.⁹

In the early nineteenth century biblical studies started to come under the influence of G. W. F. Hegel (1770-1831). Hegel's philosophy saw the development of history and religion, and everything else, in terms of a thesis, antithesis and subsequent thesis at a higher level. The process was then repeated, producing an evolution. Hegel's view of development was applied both to the Old Testament and to the New Testament. In 1835, at age twenty-nine, W. Vatke in his *The Religion of the Old Testament* (in German) used Hegel's dialectical approach to present a picture of the development of the Israelite religion. J. Wellhausen's immensely influential *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (1878, in German; English translation, 1885) was indebted to Hegel via Vatke. In the same

year that Vatke's book appeared F. C. Baur applied Hegel's scheme to the New Testament for the first time in a book on the Pastoral Epistles.¹⁰

Advancements in the field of textual criticism kept pace with those in literary, source, and historical criticism at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. Already in the fourteenth century Nicholas of Lyra (d. 1340) had criticized the Latin Vulgate on the basis of the Hebrew text, and, in so doing, formed a link between the Middle Ages and the Reformation.¹¹ Serious work on the preparation of editions of the text of the Bible began in the fifteenth century and was rather well developed by the time of Zohrabian. The first printed edition of a complete Hebrew Bible appeared at Soncino in 1488. However, the most significant Hebrew Bible of this period was published by Daniel Bomberg in Venice in 1524/25. Bomberg's edition remained the standard printed edition of the Hebrew Bible until this century.¹² The first printed Greek New Testament was that of Erasmus, published in 1516. This did not offer a critically established text but, rather, what came to be called "the Received Text" (Latin: *Textus Receptus*), a relatively late type of text. Between the time of Erasmus and Zohrabian, more exactly during the century before the appearance of Zohrabian's Bible, some basic principles of text critical methodology were enunciated. Rich and Bentley, between 1716 and 1720, laid down the principles upon which a critical text ought to be constructed.¹³ Modern textual criticism dates from the work of J. A. Bengel who published a text of the New Testament with critical apparatus in 1734. Forty years later, in 1774-75, J. J. Griesbach printed the first reconstructed Greek text of the New Testament, a text that at many places deviated from the Received Text. Griesbach built on Bengel's work in suggesting that manuscripts should be classified on the basis of their family relationships. This far-reaching suggestion lies at the heart of modern textual criticism. It is today the starting point for the textual criticism of the Armenian Bible.¹⁴ However, at the end of the eighteenth century the methodology of manuscript classification was too much in its infancy to be of serious use to Zohrabian, even had he been a student of it. Twenty-six years after Zohrabian's Bible appeared K. Lachmann published the first edition of the Greek New Testament (1831) that set aside the Received Text and, based on the oldest and best available manuscripts, attempted to present the most nearly original form of text.¹⁵ The subsequent development of New Testament textual criticism in the nineteenth century is as-

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

sociated with names of scholars like Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort. To consider their work here would take us beyond the confines of this brief sketch.

Interest in the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible gave impetus to work on the versions as well. By "the versions" one means the translations (e.g., the Armenian) into which the Bible in its original languages was rendered. Before we go further something must be said about the Septuagint.

The "Septuagint" (= "seventy") is the name of the Greek translation of the Old Testament. This translation was made in Alexandria by the Jewish community beginning in the third century B.C. Its name derives from the seventy translators who, according to the legend in the *Letter of Aristeas*, were involved in rendering the Hebrew text into Greek.¹⁶ It is this Greek translation with its larger canon (i.e., the Septuagint contained by the first century those books called in English "the Apocrypha") which was used by the early church. The Christian Bible consisted of the Septuagint plus the New Testament; the latter was, of course, also written in Greek. Wherever the church took the Bible it was the Greek Bible it took. This Greek Bible was then translated into the languages of the peoples to whom the church went, into Latin, Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and so on.

Each of these is a "version" or, more precisely a "subversion" since each is a "version" of a "version" (the Septuagint). In the case of the Latin version, the scholar Jerome (d. ca. 420) produced a translation based on the Hebrew text which, except for the book of Psalms, replaced the earlier Latin translations based on the Greek. However, even in the Western church the canon of the Septuagint continued to be authoritative until after the Reformation. For some other communions, like the Armenian church, the question of replacing a Greek-based translation of the Old Testament with one based on the original Hebrew does not seem to have arisen until quite recently. Also, although Zohrabian addresses the issue of the canon in 1805, the list of books he publishes in his edition is basically the Septuagint: that is, his Bible contains 2 Ezra, Judith, Tobit, 1-3 Maccabees, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Letter of Baruch. In an appendix to his edition Zohrabian prints Sirach, 3 Ezra, the Prayer of Manasseh, and the New Testament apocryphal books The Letter of the Corinthians to Paul, and The Rest of John.

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

A number of the "versions" were printed in multiple translation Bibles called polyglots in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Spanish "Complutensian Polyglot" appeared in 1522; the Paris Polyglot in 1629-45; and the London Polyglot in 1657. The Complutensian Polyglot contained the Old Testament in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek and the New Testament in Greek and Latin while the London Polyglot included the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Persian, the Samaritan Pentateuch, various Targums, and selected readings from the important Greek manuscript Codex Alexandrinus.¹⁷ The Armenian version did not appear in any of these polyglots. However, it must be remembered that the first edition of the Armenian Bible was that of Oskan, published in 1666, some years after the London Polyglot was published. Only the book of Psalms had been published in Armenian before 1666.¹⁸

Editions of most versions of the Greek Bible predate 1805 and several predate 1666, without considering the Polyglot Bibles. Indeed, the first book to come from the Gutenberg press was Jerome's Latin Vulgate, about 1456.¹⁹ A pre-Jerome edition of the Latin was published in 1743.²⁰ An edition of the New Testament in Ethiopic appeared in 1548-9 but with many typographical errors; the British and Foreign Bible Society's edition of the Bible in Ethiopic was published in 1826 and their edition of the New Testament appeared in 1830.²¹ The New Testament in Bohairic was published in 1716 and in 1731 David Wilkins published an edition of the Pentateuch in Bohairic.²² However, one should note that Wilkins corrected the text of his edition to the Greek text of the Sixtina Bible (1587).²³ Finally, the Bible in Georgian was published in Moscow in 1743 and in St. Petersburg in 1816 and 1818.²⁴ None of these editions of the versions is what we today would call "critical." The application of scientific text-critical methodology to the versions had to await the development and application of such methodology to the Greek and Hebrew Bibles.

This then is the context of Zohrabian's work. Zohrabian, working at the monastery of San Lazzaro in Venice, may not have been aware of significant research being carried out in northern Europe in the areas of literary criticism, archeology, and textual criticism. Anyway, scientific text critical methodology was still not very advanced, as noted above. It is clear that Zohrabian believed his own edition offered a purer text than the one Oskan edited in 1666. In a sense Zohrabian's Bible is a reaction against

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

Oskan. Placed in the context of the beginning of the nineteenth century we see that Zohrabian made a notable contribution to Armenian biblical scholarship and to the study of the versions of the Bible in general.

From the historical context in which Zohrabian's Bible belongs we may turn to his Bible itself and specifically to the introduction that he wrote for it. Typical of the time, the title page is very detailed, containing information that an editor would today place in a preface. The title page reads:

The Bible, Old and New Testaments, according to the accurate translation of our ancestors from the most reliable Greek text into the Armenian language; newly published from the best manuscript, with a comparison of various exemplars, together with important annotations to the text; on the basis of the work of Rev. Doctor Fr. Hovhann Zohrapian, of the Congregation of the great Mkhitar, Pontif and first Abbot; published by order of the Very Rev. Step'annosi Agonts', honoured venerable Bishop and Prelate of the Congregation of St. Lazarus; 1805, Venice, at the Press of St. Lazarus.

Zohrabian's extensive introduction is divided into several sections. First he discusses the history of the Bible, including the Septuagint, the Hexapla and the Armenian Bible. Second, Zohrabian defends his new edition of the Bible. Third, he describes the manuscripts that he chose for use in the edition. Finally, he enumerates previous editions of the Armenian Bible.

In his summary of the history of the Bible, Zohrabian explains that the Bible was first handed down among the Hebrew nation, in its language. In preparation for the Gospel, Zohrabian says, God put it into the heart of Ptolemy (Philadelphus 285-246 B.C.) to construct a library and commission for it the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek. Zohrabian's source of information for this, as he states, is the *Letter of Aristeas*, which we have mentioned above.²⁵ In his discussion of the Septuagint Zohrabian defends it over against the Hebrew. His position certainly has a long history behind it, beginning with the early church's

arguments against the synagogue as seen, for example, in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho* (ca. 155). The point at issue is, of course, that there are differences between the Septuagint and the Hebrew. These differences Zohrabian has to defend on the side of the Septuagint and not on the Hebrew. At any rate, discussion of this problem leads Zohrabian to a consideration of Origen (d. 253/4) and the Hexapla.

Origen, Zohrabian explains, carried out an exact comparison of the Greek and Hebrew texts of the Old Testament. The Hexapla is the name given to this immense book which is presented in six columns comprising (1) the Hebrew text, (2) the Hebrew text transliterated into Greek characters, (3) the Greek translation of Aquila, (4) of Symmachus, (5) the Septuagint, and (6) the translation of Theodotion.²⁶ Origen compared the Septuagint with the Hebrew, word by word, and where it was shorter than the Hebrew he added what was lacking, usually from Theodotion, and enclosed what he had added between an asterisk (*) and a metobelus (:). Where the Septuagint text was longer than the Hebrew Origen enclosed the word(s) that made it longer between an obelus (÷) and metobelus (:). Origen's great book was never recopied in its entirety and presumably perished at Caesarea during the Muslim conquest of the seventh century. However, the fifth column, containing the signs, was very popular and eventually influenced a large part of the Greek manuscript tradition as well as that of the versions. Now, among the latter is the Armenian. Zohrabian's explanation for how the signs have come to be preserved in the Armenian version, based on the *Life of Constantine*, is probably correct in general. Eusebius of Caesarea's (d. ca. 340) *Life of Constantine* records the Emperor's request that fifty copies of the Scriptures be prepared and sent from Caesarea to Constantinople and Eusebius' fulfillment of the request.²⁷ It is most likely that these fifty copies contained a Hexaplaric type of Greek text.

Zohrabian adds information concerning the translation of the Bible into Armenian that is provided by Armenian sources to what he has derived from *The Life of Constantine*. Zohrabian says that Mesrop Mashtots and Sahak had begun to make a translation of the Bible in Armenian on the basis of Syriac manuscripts.²⁸ However, they set these aside when excellent Greek manuscripts were brought back from Constantinople by seminarians after the Council of Ephesus (431). The signs in Armenian manuscripts, Zohrabian writes, connect the Armenian Bible

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

with the work of Origen, mediated via Constantinople. He says he has preserved with care in his edition such Origenian signs as he found in his base manuscript.²⁹

Zohrabian concludes the section on the history of the Bible and of the Armenian version with an assertion that the Armenian translators worked with the greatest care. This he says European scholars recognize too, even though they have only the poor text of Oskan to work with. The faults of the latter they rightly attribute, Zohrabian says, to Oskan's ignorance and reckless handling of the text. This is the first of many criticisms of Oskan's Bible in Zohrabian's introduction.

From a discussion of the history of the Bible Zohrabian turns to a defense of his new edition of the Armenian Bible. The motivation for this undertaking came from two sources, he says: (1) he was aware of innumerable corruptions in the edition of Oskan (1666); (2) he was encouraged to do so by his Archbishop. Zohrabian is quite aware of the problem of producing an edition free of imperfections and for this reason, he states, he used a number of manuscripts. The complete Bibles (he includes one which extends only from Job to Acts) he now describes one by one, giving information about the date, script, condition of preservation, scribe(s), provenance, and contents. By correlating the information given in his description of the manuscripts with that in the Venice catalogue we can determine which manuscripts Zohrabian is talking about.³⁰ They are as follows (the number in parentheses following the Venice number refers to the catalogue number as opposed to the shelf number):³¹

Zohrabian Number: 1

Central Number³²: 57

Venice Number: 1508(1)

Contents: Bible

Date: 1319

Provenance: unknown, probably Cilicia

Scribe: Hohanēs

Zohrabian Number: 2

Central Number: 141

Venice Number: 1634(2)

Contents: Bible

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

Date: 1641
Provenance: unknown
Scribe: Fatala

Zohrabian Number: 3
Central Number: 38
Venice Number: 1006(6)
Contents: Bible
Date: 13th-14th cent.
Provenance: unknown
Scribe: unknown

Zohrabian Number: 4
Central Number: 147
Venice Number: 623(3)
Contents: Bible
Date: 1648
Provenance: Persia, in the congregation of Gazik
Scribes: Tēr Gaspar the elder and his secretary, Hovanēs

Zohrabian Number: 5
Central Number: 159
Venice Number: 229(4)
Contents: Bible
Date: 1655
Provenance: unknown, probably Lov or Ilov
Scribe: Markos the deacon

Zohrabian Number: 6
Central Number: 142
Venice Number: Yerevan 188
Contents: Bible
Date: 1643
Provenance: Constantinople
Scribe: Hakob of Akn³³

Zohrabian Number: 7

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

Central Number: 161
Venice Number: 1182(7)
Contents: Bible
Date: 1656, likely earlier
Provenance: unknown, possibly Poland³⁴
Scribe: Hovann Hovanēs the scribe, a Pole

Zohrabian Number: 8
Central Number: 155
Venice Number: 1258(14)
Contents: Job to end of N.T.
Date: 1652-3
Provenance: unknown
Scribe: Alek'sianē the secretary³⁵

Zohrabian Number: 9 (=Oskan's edition)
Central Number: 22
Venice Number: Yerevan 180
Contents: Bible
Date: 1295
Provenance: Cilicia
Scribe: Step'anos

If one should ask why Zohrabian chose these particular manuscripts the answer would not be difficult to find. One need only check the accession dates of the fifteen or so Bibles, Old Testaments, and copies of the Pentateuch in the Venice collection to determine that Zohrabian very simply used all the copies of the same that were available to him. In 1805 Zohrabian had available to him in the Venice collection six complete Bibles (38, 57, 141, 142, 147, 159, 161), a partial Bible (155), and Oskan's edition (based on 22). These are the nine witnesses he used for the Old Testament. For the New Testament he used many more: for the Gospels almost thirty and for Acts and the Epistles forty. It would appear then that Zohrabian used all the manuscripts that were available to him.

As a base manuscript for collation Zohrabian used 57. Why he chose this manuscript over the other manuscripts he had is clear from his description of the manuscript. He was impressed with this manuscript

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

which is old, complete, and, though not elegant in outward appearance, is written in a script that is clearly the work of a skillful scribe. Zohrabian connects the manuscript with Cilicia. A colophon mentions a certain Gēorg whom we know now to be Gēorg Skevrats'i (George of Skevra, 1246/7-1301), a significant biblical scholar.³⁶ The only manuscript available to Zohrabian in Venice older than 57 was manuscript 38 which is defective at points and which, at any rate, appears to contain the same Cilician type of text as 57.³⁷ Given the defectiveness of 38 and the well preserved condition of 57, the choice of 57 for a base manuscript was not likely a very difficult one to make.

Next, Zohrabian enumerates earlier editions of the Armenian Bible and offers an extensive and pointed criticism of Oskan's edition, the only edition of the complete Armenian Bible published before Zohrabian's own edition. The editions Zohrabian lists are as follows: (1) the Psalms, printed in 1565; (2) Oskan's Bible, 1666; (3) a missal containing Oskan's text, published in Venice in 1686; (4) a reprint of Oskan's Bible, made in Constantinople in 1705; (5) a reprint of Oskan's Bible made in Venice in 1733 by Mkhitar of Sebastia.³⁸ In the last case, Mkhitar, Zohrabian says, was aware of mistakes in Oskan's edition but lacked the Armenian manuscripts to make the necessary corrections. For this reason he used the Latin translation in the Paris Polyglot to make corrections of Oskan in the margins of the reprint. The resulting edition has all the faults of its source, Oskan's Bible.

Zohrabian's criticism of Oskan's Bible, one surmises, grows out of his need to defend the preparation of a new edition against those who thought that another printing of Oskan would suffice. Zohrabian is not unappreciative of Oskan whom he realizes worked at a time when there was little published in Armenian. That appreciation, however, does not prevent him from being quite critical of Oskan's lack of textual methodology. Zohrabian's criticisms here remain valid. Oskan, Zohrabian says, endeavored to correct the Armenian text (based on the Septuagint) by the use of the Latin Vulgate (based on the Hebrew). The result is a mixed text. Zohrabian's second criticism of Oskan is that he translated Sirach, Fourth Ezra, and the Letter of Jeremiah from the Latin into barbarous Armenian. Those philologists who rightfully criticized these translations Oskan called "lofty sophists," according to Zohrabian. Finally, Zohrabian criticizes Oskan because he used only one manuscript for his edition and

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

was thus forced to reproduce the errors of that manuscript.

Having established the need for a new edition, Zohrabian now describes the way he has put together his edition. His comments here are very useful for understanding the composition of Zohrabian's Bible. They are six in number.

First, Zohrabian discusses the arrangement of the books in his Bible and deals with the issue of canon. In contrast to Oskan who, Zohrabian says, followed the order of the books in the Latin Bible, he has followed the arrangement of the books in manuscript 57 and other Armenian manuscripts. Here Zohrabian has to address the issue of canon and does so as it relates to the books of Sirach, The Revelation of John, and The Letter of Jeremiah. The book of Sirach Zohrabian leaves out of the Old Testament canon, putting it in the Appendix following the New Testament. His reasons for this are that (1) although it is in three younger manuscripts he has used (147, 155, 159) it does not have the usual introduction and list of chapters; (2) the church's missal does not indicate that anything was read from Sirach. On the other hand, Zohrabian includes as part of the New Testament The Revelation of John. All manuscripts of Zohrabian's day included Revelation even though, he says, he doubts whether its translation into Armenian predates the eighth century. The difference between Sirach and Revelation is that the former was never part of the Armenian canon. As proof of this Zohrabian cites from the Canon of the Council of Partaw where Sirach stands outside the canon of the Old Testament.³⁹ Finally, Zohrabian says he left out the Letter of Jeremiah which Oskan had placed after Baruch.

Second, Zohrabian says that for his edition of the Bible he has included the introductions and lists of chapters for each book together with the numbering in the margins which most manuscripts have. Oskan omitted these and Zohrabian takes pains to show that he was wrong in so doing by arguing for their antiquity. He thinks that the introductions and lists might come from Greek originals. However, he admits that they are not found in any extant Greek manuscript. He is able to say that lists of chapters similar to those in the Armenian Bible appear in a seventh-century Syriac manuscript in the Ambrosian library in Milan. He shows by this remark that he had attempted to do research on the source of the introductions and lists of chapters. In point of fact, Geōrg Skrevats'i is responsible for the inclusion of these materials which derive from old

sources.⁴⁰ For the New Testament Zohrabian has provided for the Gospels the Eusebian canon lists as well as introductions which he believes are the work of Eusebius or Pamphilus. For Acts and the Epistles he has added the prefaces and list of chapters which are the work of Euthalius. Zohrabian therefore made his edition a repository of interesting patristic editorial data. He was not, however, uncritical even here for, on the one hand, he goes on to say that he left out of his edition a number of items that appear in manuscript 57: in the Old Testament the second introduction that appears with some books, Epiphanius' "Concerning the Psalms," and the Deaths of the Prophets. On the other hand, Zohrabian included Sirach in his edition even though it does not appear in manuscript 57. Sirach, Zohrabian notes, is preserved in other Armenian manuscripts, the Latin Vulgate and other versions of the Scriptures.

Third, Zohrabian discusses the apparatus to the text he has presented. The number of manuscripts which Zohrabian had at his disposal allowed him to correct scribal errors in manuscript 57 and to provide a selection of readings varying from that manuscript. The apparatus sets forth what Zohrabian did in regard to these two items. The categories of readings to be found in the apparatus are as follows:

1. Where Zohrabian corrected the text of his manuscript on the basis of the unanimous agreement of all the other manuscripts at his disposal, the entry in the apparatus begins with "in the exemplar" (*horinakin*) and continues with the reading of manuscript 57. For example, at Matthew 1:8, Zohrabian prints as his text *tsnav zhovram* ([Jehoshaphat] begat Joram) and in the apparatus has "In the exemplar, *tsnav zovram* ([Jehoshaphat] begat Ovrām)." Here Zohrabian has corrected a misspelling in manuscript 57, created by the loss of one letter.

2. Marginal readings of 57 which are found in the text of other manuscripts Zohrabian records as follows: "In the margin (*i lusants*) such and such, agreeing with the reading in the text of some or the majority of other manuscripts." (On the meaning of "some" and "the majority," see below.) As an example of this type of note in the apparatus we may cite Genesis 1:11: "In the margin of our exemplar there is put *zbanjar khotoy* which agrees with the reading in the text of other manuscripts." The difference between the reading in the margin of 57 and that found in the text is just the direct object marker *z-* of the former. In citing such read-

ings Zohrabian has preserved in his edition an intriguing stage in the history of the text of the Armenian Bible. As he indicates, these marginal readings of 57 are found in the text of some other manuscripts. In point of fact, the marginal readings of 57 are also found in the margins of other manuscripts—all of them, like 57, Cilician in origin. The significance of the marginal readings is that they are the result of a comparison of one type of Armenian text type, the Cilician, with another or others. This undertaking may be the work of Gēorg Skevrats'i, mentioned above. The practical usefulness of these readings is that they may represent a more original type of text than that preserved in the text of 57.⁴¹

3. The third category of readings found in Zohrabian's apparatus is that of readings found in the other manuscripts which Zohrabian used. Within this third category there are three differentiations made in the apparatus: (a) When between two and half of the manuscripts agree against 57 the variant is introduced with the word "some" (*omank'*). See, for example, Genesis 1:7. Zohrabian says that most variants are of this type. (b) When more than half the manuscripts at Zohrabian's disposal agree against 57 (so that only one or two agree with 57) the reading in the apparatus is introduced with the word "the majority" (*bazumk'*). See, for example, Matthew 1:23. (c) In cases where the other manuscripts Zohrabian used share a reading against 57 but Zohrabian has chosen to follow the reading of 57 in the text, the reading in the apparatus is introduced by "the others" (*aylk'*). See Genesis 1:29 for an example of this. In such cases, Zohrabian believes the reading of 57 to be better, i.e., closer to the Greek, than the reading shared by the other manuscripts. (d) Readings attested by a single manuscript are introduced in the apparatus by "an exemplar" (*orinak mi*). For an example, see Genesis 2:19. Zohrabian's reasons for preserving such readings are twofold, he says: first, such readings are sometimes found in old and respected witnesses; second, he wished to show that variant readings are sometimes the result of copyists taking too great a liberty with the text, not simply the result of carelessness. It is for the second reason that Zohrabian gives readings from Oskan's edition, namely, to show how Oskan tried to correct the Armenian text. Zohrabian cites Oskan for the first time in Genesis 1:26.

Zohrabian is selective in his recording of readings in his apparatus. He says that it was not his object to give all differences among the manuscripts but, rather, to offer the most important ones. He does not give

those which are simply the result of scribal error.

It remains a source of regret for its users that Zohrabian's apparatus does not more specifically indicate the manuscripts which attest particular readings. The general terms "some," "majority," "an exemplar" are quite useless. They refer, it is true, to a relatively small group of manuscripts but what does "the majority" among eight manuscripts mean when there are eighty or ninety (at least) other manuscripts which Zohrabian did not happen to have available to him? Had he specified which manuscripts differ from manuscript 57 Zohrabian would have greatly increased the lasting value of his text as a critical endeavor.

The final section of Zohrabian's introduction deals with the issues of orthography, punctuation, accentuation, and chapter and verse division in the edition. So far as orthography is concerned, Zohrabian says that he used *ō* for classical *aw*, following modern convention even though manuscript 57 reads *aw*. However, in the case of proper names he follows the older orthography (for example, *Sawghos*, Saul, rather than *Soghos*). Zohrabian standardized the punctuation of the text in his edition since it is not consistent in manuscript 57. So, too, in the matter of accentuation Zohrabian introduced consistency. The accentuation of the names of the Apostles follows the Greek rather than Armenian custom. (Armenian uniformly accents the last syllable of a word.) The chapter and verse division of Zohrabian's edition follows the Latin; such division appears in manuscripts that Zohrabian used.

Zohrabian's edition may properly be regarded as the single most important work of Armenian biblical scholarship since the patristic period. It is evident from the Introduction that Zohrabian worked carefully and with a clear text-critical methodology. His faithfulness to the task of producing an accurate reproduction of the classical text based on the resources available to him stands in contrast to the treatment some other versions received at the hands of their editors. This has meant that Zohrabian's text has remained to this day the starting-point for new editions of the various books of the biblical corpus such as Deuteronomy and Daniel.

Since Zohrabian's day the methodology of textual criticism has

been more precisely defined. No longer is it sufficient to rely on an old and carefully copied exemplar when producing even a diplomatic edition of an Armenian biblical text. Rather, manuscripts are first separated into families and the textual relations of these families analyzed vis-à-vis the parent text. An edition is then based on manuscript(s) of that family preserving the purest form of text, with variant readings supported by manuscripts of other families being placed in an apparatus.⁴² A fully critical edition relies much less on a single witness but, rather, offers an eclectic text which at all points is governed by the attempt to present, on the basis of various manuscripts, the text in a form most closely resembling the way it was when it left the translator's hands. Among recent editions of Armenian biblical texts those of Deuteronomy and Daniel⁴³ are diplomatic while that of IV Ezra is critical.⁴⁴

Such recent editions permit us to put the text printed by Zohrabian in its proper perspective. It represents only as pure a form of text as manuscript 57 offers. The form of text of manuscript 57 is a relatively developed type of text, a Cilician text type as opposed to the type of text found, say, in Armenia proper in the thirteenth century.⁴⁵ The complicated story of the development of the textual traditions of the Armenian Old Testament and New Testament was simply unknown in 1805 and is still not fully understood. Lyonnet, in his epochal study of the Armenian text of the Gospels, was able to argue convincingly for the existence of an Old Armenian translation of the Gospels (which he calls Arm 1). This translation antedates the later text type represented by Zohrabian's edition (which he calls Arm 2).⁴⁶ In his recent work on Armenian Daniel, Cowe makes a similar argument: he argues for an initial translation (Arm 1) in which the translator consulted a Syriac and Greek text simultaneously and a later revision of this (which he calls Arm 2). No Armenian manuscript has escaped the effects of this revision.⁴⁷ One wonders how Zohrabian would have gone about producing his edition had he had such studies available to him. He would not likely have chosen to reproduce manuscript 57 since other manuscripts such as Jerusalem 1925 or Yerevan 1500 have shown themselves to offer a purer form of text wherever they have been analyzed. Still, Zohrabian's edition remains a faithful reproduction of a particular text type and, for that reason, will continue to be a significant resource for the study of the Armenian Bible.

I would like to thank Sahak Kalaydjian, Librarian of the Library

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

of Printed Books, Armenian Patriarchate, Jerusalem; Robert W. Thomson and Kevork B. Bardakjian, Harvard University; and J. W. Wevers, University of Toronto, for facilitating in different ways the writing of this introduction; and Michael E. Stone, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, who graciously provided the copy of Zohrabian's Bible upon which this reprint is based.

NOTES

1. Zohrapian's name is written Zohrabian in Western Armenian. Often "Zohrabian" is shortened further to simply "Zohrab."

2. On biblical studies in the eighteenth century generally see Edward Carpenter, "The Bible in the Eighteenth Century," in D. E. Nineham, ed., *The Church's Use of the Bible* (London: SPCK, 1963), pp. 89-124. Robert Davidson and A. R. C. Leaney's *Biblical Criticism* (The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology, 3; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970) is a useful introduction to the critical study of the Bible. A briefer survey of the subject is provided by Samuel Terrien, "History of the Interpretation of the Bible, III. Modern Period," *Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952), pp. 127-141, and, more recently, by Edgar Krentz in *The Historical-Critical Method* (Guides to Biblical Scholarship; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

3. See the comments of James Henry Breasted in *Earlier Historical Records of Ramses III* (Medinet Habu, Vol. I; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930), p. ix; also S. A. Cook, "The Present Stage of Old Testament Research," in *Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day by Members of the University of Cambridge*, ed. Henry Barclay Swete (London: Macmillan and Co., 1909), p. 59.

4. S. N. Kramer, *The Sumerians* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 8.

5. Alexander Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, 2d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), p. 1 ff.

6. W.G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, tr. A. J. Mattill, Jr. (London: SCM Press, 1965), pp. 37-39.

7. Terrien, p. 136. "Hexateuch" refers to the six books extending from Genesis to Joshua.

8. Herbert F. Hahn, *The Old Testament in Modern Research*, expanded ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 4, n. 4.

9. O. Betz, "Biblical Theology, History of," in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), vol. 1, p. 433. "Biblical Theology" attempts to unify the thought of the Bible by using categories which derive from the Bible itself.

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

10. Cf. the article on Baur in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F. L. Cross, 2d ed. rev. by F. L. Cross and E. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 144.

11. James D. Wood, *The Interpretation of the Bible* (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1958), pp. 82-83. F. W. Farrar, in his tendentious *History of Interpretation* (Bampton Lectures 1885; New York: E. P. Dutton, 1886; rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961, 1979), p. 274, calls Nicholas "the Jerome of the fourteenth century."

12. Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, 2d ed., tr. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979).

13. Stephen Neill, *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1961* (The Firth Lectures, 1962; London: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 65. Bentley used to emend manuscripts without much hesitation. Cf. remarks about Wilkins and Oskan Yervantsi, below.

14. The genealogical approach is outlined clearly in Paul Maas' *Textual Criticism*, tr. B. Fowler (1958; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).

15. Jack Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974; London: SPCK, 1975), pp. 62-63. Finegan offers a useful introduction to the art of New Testament textual criticism.

16. There is a sizeable body of literature devoted to the question of what can actually be determined about the origin of the Septuagint from the Letter of Aristeas. Most recently see J. W. Wevers, "An Apologia for Septuagint Studies," in press, who argues that one can accept from the Aristeas legend only that 1) the Septuagint is Alexandrian in origin and that 2) the Pentateuch was translated in the third century B.C.

17. See the article "Polyglot Bibles" in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, pp. 1107-1108, and references in H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, rev. by R. R. Ottley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902; rpt. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1968) and Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

18. See the survey of published Armenian Bibles and partial Armenian Bibles in "Astuatsashunch' Mateani Haykakan Bnagirē" (Bibliae Sacrae Versio Armena [Bibliographia]), by H. S. Anassian in *Haykakan Matenagitut'iwn B* (Yerevan: Academy of Sciences, 1976), cols. 359 ff.

19. Bruce M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), p. 348.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 319.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 230.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 122.

23. See M. K. H. Peters, "The 'Value' of the Bohairic Printed Editions," *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 9 (1976), pp. 47-58.

24. Swete, *Introduction*, p. 120.

25. The Greek text, prepared by H. St. J. Thackeray, may be found in Swete, *Introduction*, pp. 533-666; English translation by H. T. Andrews in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ed. R. H. Charles (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913,

THE ZOHRAH BIBLE

rpt. 1963), vol. 2, pp. 83-122. See also n.16 above.

26. For an example of the arrangement of the columns see Swete, *Introduction*, p. 62 ff.

27. The Greek text of chaps. 34-37 can be found in J.-P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae Graecae*, vol. 20 (Petit-Montrouge, 1857), cols. 1182-1186. There is an English translation of *The Life of Constantine*, prepared by E. D. Richardson, in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 2d ser., ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1961), vol. 1, pp. 473-559.

28. On the question of the parent text (Syriac and/or Greek) of the earliest Armenian translation of the Bible cf. Claude Cox, *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 2; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981), pp. 7-12 and, more recently, S. Peter Cowe, "The Armenian Version of Daniel: Diplomatic Edition and Investigation of Its Textual Affinities," Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1983. Cowe believes that the Armenian translator of Daniel consulted a Syriac and Greek text simultaneously.

29. As Zohrabian notes, the signs' tradition underwent corruption at the hands of scribes who did not understand its significance. The manuscript which Zohrabian used for his edition preserves relatively few signs but some manuscripts preserve several hundred. I have collected the signs' material from selected manuscripts to publish in a book entitled *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version*.

30. The catalogue of Venice manuscripts is that of B. V. Sargisian, ed., *Mair Ts'uts'ak Hayeren Dzeragrats Matenadaranin Mkhit'areants'i Venetik* [Grand Catalogue of Armenian Manuscripts of the Mechitarist Library in Venice] (Venice: St. Ghazar, 1914), I.

31. The same list has been worked out independently by Cowe, "Daniel," p. 401, who, however, does not correlate his list to the numbers of Zohrabian's introduction: manuscript 141 is the second manuscript described by Zohrabian, the first being 57 (= 1508[1]).

32. This refers to the list of A. Zeytunian, "Astuatsashunch'i Hayeren T'argmanut'yan Dzeragrats'akan Miavorneri Dasakargman Masin" [Concerning a Central Manuscript Classification for the Armenian Translation of the Bible], *Banber Matenadaran* 12 (1977), pp. 295-304, supplemented by Cox in *Deuteronomy*, pp. 15-16, n. 2.

33. The Yerevan catalogue is that of L. Khach'ikian and A. Mnats'akanian, eds., *Ts'uts'ak Dzeragrats' Mashtots'i Anvan Matenadaran* [Catalogue of Manuscripts of the Mashtots Library], introd. by O. Eganian, prepared by O. Eganian, A. Zeyt'unian, P. Ant'abian, 2 vols. (Yerevan: Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR, 1965 and 1970). The information concerning manuscript 142 as well as the other manuscripts in the list (except for 155) is derived from *Deuteronomy*, pp. 16-31, which, in turn, is based on the respective catalogues.

34. Michael E. Stone, *The Armenian Version of IV Ezra* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 1; Missoula, 1979), p. 16, suggests Constantinople; so also Cowe, "Daniel," p. 49.

35. Alek'sianē the secretary was the writer of the whole. However, the Revelation of John was written by two scribes, Abraham the elder and Astuatsatur. No prove-

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

nance is given for the manuscript though one of the colophons states that Abraham was from the village of Bjni. Sargisian, *Mair Ts'uts'ak*, I, cols. 133-140. Bjni is situated in Ayrarat province: see Avedis K. Sanjian, *Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, 1301-1480* (Harvard Armenian Texts and Studies, 2; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969), p. 397.

36. George of Skevra is responsible for the addition to the Armenian Bible of introductions to books of the Old Testament and tables of chapters. See Vincent Mistrih, "Trois Biographies de Georges de Skevra," *Studia Orientalia Christiana Armenica* (Extrait de Collectanea, 14; Cairo: Editions du Centre Franciscain de l'Etudes Orientales Chrétiennes, 1970), pp. 251-372. George may well be responsible also for the marginal readings which appear in Cilician manuscripts, including 57, and which provide readings from a different textual tradition. Cf. "Concerning a Cilician Revision of the Armenian Bible," in A. Pietersma and C. Cox, eds., *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, forthcoming.

37. See *Deuteronomy*, pp. 49-51, and Cowe, "Daniel," pp. 26-29, 55-56.

38. On Mkhitar of Sebastia (1676-1749) and the contributions of his religious order to Armenian scholarship see Kevork B. Bardakjian, *The Mekhitarist Contributions to Armenian Culture and Scholarship* (Cambridge: Middle Eastern Department, Harvard College Library, 1976).

39. For the canon list of Partaw see Michael E. Stone, "Armenian Canon Lists I - The Council of Partaw (768 C.E.)," *Harvard Theological Review* 66 (1973): 479-486. The Partaw list rests on Greek traditions and it is an open question to what extent the list reflects Armenian usage. Sirach does appear as part of Gregory of Tat'ew's fourteenth-century canon list. See Stone, "Armenian Canon Lists IV - The List of Gregory of Tat'ew (14th Century)," *Harvard Theological Review* 72 (1979): 237-244.

40. See Mistrih, "Trois Biographies," p. 271.

41. For more information on the marginal readings see "Concerning the Cilician Revision of the Armenian Bible," cited in n. 36 above.

42. The first attempt to set the choice of manuscripts for an edition of an Armenian biblical text upon scientific principles is that of Michael E. Stone, "The Old Armenian Version of Isaiah: Towards the Choice of the Base Text for an Edition," *Textus* 8 (1973), pp. 106-125. I do not intend here to summarize the recent history of biblical scholarship as it pertains to the Armenian version. That information can be found in Cox, "Biblical Studies and the Armenian Bible: 1955-1980," *Revue Biblique* 89 (1982): 99-113.

43. The editions of *Deuteronomy* and *Daniel* are cited above in n. 28.

44. Stone's edition of IV *Ezra* is cited above in n. 34.

45. On textual groupings of Armenian biblical manuscripts see Cox, "Manuscript Groupings in the Textual Tradition of the Armenian Bible," *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 1 (in press).

46. S. Lyonnet, *Les origines de la Version arménienne et la Diatessaron* (Biblica et Orientalia 13; Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1950).

47. Cowe, "Daniel," p. 390 ff.

THE ZOHRAH BIBLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For bibliographical details of works published concerning the Armenian Bible up to 1980 see:

Anassian, H. S. "Astuatsashunch' Matean Haykakan Bnagirë" (Bibliae Sacrae Versio Armena [Bibliographia]) in *Haykakan Matenagitut'iwn B* (Yerevan: Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR, 1976), cols. 305-670.

Cox, C. "Biblical Studies and the Armenian Bible, 1955-1980," *Revue Biblique* 89 (1982): 99-113.

To these may be added the following bibliographical items. I have divided the bibliography for 1980-1993 into two parts, 1980-1984 and 1985-1993. The introduction to *The Zohrab Bible* draws on research up to the date of publication of the Caravan Books reprint edition of 1984 and includes a bibliography for the four-year period between the end of the twenty-five years (from 1955-1980) covered in the *Revue Biblique* article and the date of publication. I have filled out that bibliography by clarifying the status of articles that were, e.g., in press at the time and by including additional items.

The second part covers the period between 1985 and 1993.

Bibliography: 1980-1984

Alexanian, Joseph M. "The Armenian Version in Luke and the Question of the Caesarean Text." Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1982. See *Dissertation Abstracts* 43 (6A): 2003.

_____. "The Armenian Gospel Text from the Fifth through the Fourteenth Centuries," in *Medieval Armenian Culture*, ed. T. Samuelian and M. Stone, University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 6 (Chico: Scholars, 1983): 381-394.

Anasean, H. S. "Une leçon symmachienne dans les manuscrits arméniens de la Bible (pour l'histoire du texte des Hexaples d'Origène), *Revue*

THE ZOHRA BIBLE

- des Etudes Arméniennes*, N.S. 17 (1983): 201–205 (= *Handes Amso-rya* 97 [1983], 1–6, cols. 93–100 [in Armenian]).
- Annual of Armenian Linguistics*. 1980–. Editor: John A. C. Greppin. Editorial office: Annual of Armenian Linguistics, RT 1205, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH 44115.
- Bundy, David D. "The Sources of the Isaiah Commentary of Georg Skewi ac'i," in *Medieval Armenian Culture*, ed. T. Samuelian and M. Stone, University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 6 (Chico: Scholars, 1983): 395–414.
- Burchard, Christoph. "Joseph und Aseneth 25–29 armenisch," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 10 (1979): 1–10.
- Cowe, S. Peter. "The Armenian Version of Daniel: Diplomatic Edition and Investigation of Its Textual Affinities." Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1983. Director: Michael E. Stone. See below: published 1992.
- . "A Typology of Armenian Biblical Manuscripts," *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, N.S. 18 (1984): 49–67.
- Cox, C. *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy*. University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 2; Chico, 1981. This was a 1979 University of Toronto doctoral thesis; director: J. W. Wevers. See Weitenberg and de Leeuw van Weenen (1990).
- . "A Report on the Critical Edition of the Armenian Old Testament," *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes*, N.S. 16 (1982): 451–456.
- and Michael E. Stone, "Guidelines for Editions of Armenian Biblical Texts," *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 15 (1982), pp. 51–59 = *REArm*, N.S. 17 (1983): 627–633.
- . "The Use of Lectionary Manuscripts to Establish the Text of the Armenian Bible," in *Medieval Armenian Culture*, ed. T. Samuelian and M. Stone, University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 6 (Chico: Scholars, 1983): 365–380.
- . "Concerning a Cilician Revision of the Armenian Bible," in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Albert Pietersma and C. Cox (Mississauga, ON: Benben, 1984): 209–221.
- . "Manuscript Groupings in the Text Tradition of the Armenian Bible," *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 1 (1984), 69–77.

- . "The Textual Character of the Manuscript Printed as Text in Zohrapéan's Bible," *Essays in Honour of Archbishop Norayr Bogharian*, ed. Michael E. Stone and S. Peter Cowe = *REArm*, N.S. 18 (1984): 69–83.
- . "The Use of the *Participium Necessitatis* in the Armenian Translation of the Pentateuch," *International Symposium on Armenian Linguistics (Yerevan, September 21–25, 1982)*, ed. G. B. Djahukian (Yerevan: Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR, 1984): 337–351.
- Evans, Helen D. "Canon Tables as an Indication of Teacher-Pupil Relationships in the Career of T'oros Roslin," in *Medieval Armenian Culture*, ed. T. Samuelian and M. Stone, University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 6 (Chico: Scholars, 1983): 272–290.
- Johnson, Bo. "Armenian Biblical Tradition in Comparison with the Vulgate and Septuagint," in *Medieval Armenian Culture*, ed. T. Samuelian and M. Stone, University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 6 (Chico: Scholars, 1983): 357–364.
- Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies*. 1984–. Editor, vols. 1–5: Avedis K. Sanjian.
- Lehmann, Henning J. "Some Questions Concerning the Armenian Version of the Epistle of James," *Aarhus Armeniaca*. (= Acts Jutlandica LVI, Humanities Series 56.) Århus: Århus University Press 1982.
- Mercier, Charles. *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim I et II e versione armeniaca*. Introduction, translation and notes. *Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie* 5, Bd. 34A. Paris: Cerf, 1979.
- Nor Ktakaran. *Aravelahayerēn Nor T'argmanut'iwn Hamematut'eamb Hunarēn Bnagreri* [The New Testament. A New Translation in Eastern Armenian, with a Comparison of Greek Manuscripts]. Echmiadzin: Mair At'or 1976.
- Nor Ktakaran. *Arevmtahayerēn Nor T'argmanut'iwn Hanematut'eamb Hunarēn Bnagreri* [The New Testament. A New Translation in Western Armenian, with a Comparison of Greek Manuscripts]. Jerusalem: St. James Press/United Bible Societies 1981.
- Renoux, C., ed. *Hésychius de Jérusalem, Homélies sur Job*. Version arménienne. Homélies I–XI. Tr. Charles Mercier and Charles Renoux. *Patrologia Orientalis* 42; Turnhout: Brepols, 1983. See also Renoux's articles cited below. Rev.: J. A. C. Greppin, *Annual of Armenian Lin-*

- guistics* 5 (1984): 119–120.
- _____. “L’Église de Sion dans les *Homélies sur Job* d’Hésychius de Jérusalem,” in *Essays in Honour of Archbishop Norayr Bogharian*, ed. Michael E. Stone and S. Peter Cowe = *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, N.S. 18.1 (1984): 135–146.
- Siebert, Folker, ed. and tr. *Drie hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten. Ps.-Philon, “Über Jona,” “Über Simson” und “Über die Gottesbezeichnung ‘wohltätig verzehrendes Feuer,’”* Bd. 1. Übersetzung aus Armenischen und sprachliche Erläuterung; Wiss. Untersuchungen zum N.T. 20; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1980.
- Stone, Michael E. “Two Leaves of Acts in the Perkins Library, Duke University,” *Sion* 43 (1979): 24.
- _____, with Nira Stone. “An Illuminated Armenian Gospel in the National and University Library, Jerusalem,” *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, N.S. 14 (1980): 435–441.
- _____. “Armenian Canon Lists IV: The List of Gregory of Tat’ew (14th Century),” *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 237–244.
- _____. “Report on Seth in the Armenian Adam Books,” in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, ed. Bentley Layton. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981. Vol. 2: 460–471.
- _____. “Jewish Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Church,” *Le Muséon* 95 (1982): 285–309.
- _____, ed. *The Penitence of Adam*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 429–430; Scriptores armeniaci 13–14; Louvain: 1981. Review of this and the following two items: J.-P. Mahé, in *REArm* 18 (1984): 629–631.
- _____, ed. *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to the Patriarchs and Prophets*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1982.
- _____. *An Analytical Index of Armenian Apocrypha Relating to the Patriarchs and Prophets*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Institute of Jewish Studies, 1982.
- _____. “The Armenian Version,” in *Bible Translation: An Introduction*, ed. Ch. Rabin (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1984): 143–147.
- _____. “The History of the Forefathers, Adam and his Sons and Grandsons,” *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 1 (1984): 79–91.
- Ter Petrosyan, L. H. *La littérature arménienne ancienne de traduction*. Yerevan: Sovetakan Grogh, 1984.

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

- . "La plus ancienne Traduction des 'Chroniques'," in *Essays in Honour of Archbishop Norayr Bogharian*, ed. Michael E. Stone and S. Peter Cowe = *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, N.S. 18.1 (1984): 215–225.
- Thomson, Robert W. "Gregory of Narek's Commentary on the Song of Songs," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. 34 (1983): 453–496.

Bibliography: 1985–1993

There is a considerable bibliography for this period, thanks in large part to three conferences. The first was a workshop sponsored by the Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes and convened at Sandbjerg, the Conference Centre of Åarhus University, in July 1989. Its subject was "Priorities, Problems and Techniques of Text Editions." The Proceedings appeared as *Armenian Texts Tasks and Tools* in 1993, edited by Henning Lehmann and Jos Weitenberg.

The second conference was convened at Heidelberg, 16–19 July 1990, again under the aegis of AIEA, in conjunction with the Internationales Wissenschaftsforum der Universität Heidelberg. The symposium was devoted to "Armenia and the Bible: Culture, Tradition, and Text." The papers given there appeared in 1993 also, in *Armenia and the Bible*, edited by Christoph Burchard.

A third collection of papers will appear soon. These were given at the Conference on the Armenian New Testament, held on 22–24 May 1992, in conjunction with the dedication of the Alex and Marie Manoogian Museum at St. John's Armenian Church, Southfield, Michigan. The editors of this volume are Shahé Ajamian and Michael Stone and it will appear in the series University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies.

One may make note briefly of particular contributions and ongoing research. First, there is the catalogue of biblical manuscripts prepared by Shahé Ajamian; second, the editions of Genesis and Exodus prepared by Andranik Zeyt'unian; third, the publication of Peter Cowe's dissertation on Daniel; fourth, Michael Stone's ongoing work on the Armenian apocryphal literature; fifth, Joseph Alexanian's involvement in the Interna-

tional Project on the Greek Text of Acts; sixth, the important contributions of Jos Weitenberg to our understanding of the development of Armenian lexical forms; finally, Arch. Norayr Bogharian's completion of his massive work of cataloguing the manuscripts at the St. James Convent in Jerusalem.

Adalian, Rouben P. "From Scripture to Text to Icon: The Armenian Bible in View of Modern Technology and Scholarship" in Burchard, ed., *Armenia and the Bible*: 1-14.

Ajamian, Shahé. *Girk' Saghmosats' Davt'i* [Book of the Psalms of David]. Jerusalem: Mount of Olives Armenian Bible Center, 1989.

_____. *Ts'uts'ak Astuatsashunch' Mateani Hayeren Dzeragirnerun* [Catalogue of Armenian Biblical Manuscripts]. Lisbon: C. Gulbenkian Foundation, 1992.

_____. "Commentaire sur l'édition critique du Livre de la Genèse en Arménien," in *Armenian Texts Tasks and Tools*, ed. Lehmann and Weitenberg: 57-64.

_____. "An Introduction to the Book of Psalms by David Anghaght," *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 15-21.

_____ and Michael E. Stone, ed. *Text and Context: Studies in the Armenian New Testament. Papers Presented to the Conference on the Armenian New Testament May 22-24, 1992*. Alex and Marie Manoogian Museum Publication Series No. 1; University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies; Atlanta, forthcoming.

_____. "The Colophon of the Gospel of Hethoum Bayl," in *Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, ed. Ajamian and Stone: 1-16.

_____. "The First Attempt to Prepare a Critical Edition of the Armenian Bible," paper given at the 10th Anniversary Conference of the Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes, University of London, September 1-5, 1993. To be published in the proceedings, by School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

Alexanian, Joseph M. "The Text of the Oldest Armenian Manuscript in America: a Reappraisal of Walters Art Gallery Ms 537," *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 5 (1990-1991): 55-64.

_____. "Armenian Versions," *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York/London: Doubleday 1992) vol. 6: 805-808.

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

- _____. "The Profile Method and the Identifying of Textual Groups within the Armenian [biblical] Ms Tradition," in *Armenian Texts Tasks and Tools*, ed. Lehmann and Weitenberg: 44–56.
- _____. "Remarks on the Armenian Text of Acts of the Apostles," in *Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, ed. Ajamian and Stone: 17–26.
- Avakian, Anne M., compiler. *Armenia and the Armenians in Academic Dissertations*. Supplement One. A Bibliography. Berkeley, CA: Professional Press, Inc., 1987. Distributed by A. M. Avakian, 2727 Parker St., Berkeley, CA 94704. Cites dissertations by Alexanian, Cowe and Cox. The latter two have been published; for the former see the bibliography above for 1980–1984.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. "Remarks on the Text of the Book of Revelation in Armenian," paper given at the 10th Anniversary Conference of the Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes, University of London, September 1–5, 1993. To be published in the proceedings, by School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Bogharian, Arch. Norayr, ed. *Grand Catalogue of St. James Manuscripts*. Vol. 10. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation Armenian Library. Jerusalem: St. James Printing Press, 1990.
- _____, ed. *Grand Catalogue of St. James Manuscripts*. Vol. 11. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation Armenian Library. Jerusalem: St. James Printing Press, 1991.
- _____. *Hay Grich'ner (T'–ŽĖ Dar)* [Armenian Scribes 9th–17th Centuries]. Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1992.
- Burchard, Christoph, ed. *Armenia and the Bible. Papers Presented to the International Symposium Held at Heidelberg July 16–19, 1990*. University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 12; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993.
- Coulie, Bernard. *Répertoire des catalogues et des bibliothèques de manuscrits arméniens*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca; Turnhout: Brepols, 1992.
- _____. See J. Nimmo Smith.
- _____. "New Testament Quotations and Textual Criticism in the Armenian Version of Gregory Nazianzus," in *Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, ed. Ajamian and Stone: 27–38.
- Cowe, S. Peter. "The Armenian Version of Ruth and Its Textual Affini-

- ties," in *La Septuaginta en la Investigacion Contemporanea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos. Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34; Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano" C.S.I.C., 1985: 183-197.
- _____. "Gēorg Skewrac'i and the Cilician Vulgate," paper given at the 3rd Conference of the Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes, Brussels, 22-24 September 1986.
- _____. Review: A. S. Zeyt'unyan, *Girk' Cnndoc' k'nnakan Bnagir* [Critical Text of the Book of Genesis], *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988): 180-182.
- _____. "The Canticle of Azariah and its Two Armenian Versions," *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies*, 5 (1990-1991): 23-48.
- _____. *The Armenian Version of Daniel*. University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 9; Atlanta: Scholars, 1992.
- _____. "An Armenian Job Fragment from Sinai and Its Implications," *Oriens Christianus* 72 (1992): 123-157.
- _____. Problematics of Edition of Armenian Biblical Texts," *Armenian Texts Tasks and Tools*, ed. Lehmann and Weitenberg: 26-37.
- _____. "Christological Trends and Textual Transmission: The Pericope of the Bloody Sweat (Lk. 22:43-44) in the Armenian Version," in *Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, ed. Ajamian and Stone: 39-56, forthcoming.
- _____. "The Song of the Three Youths (Dan. 3:51-90) in the Caucasian Versions and Antiochene Exegesis," in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (Paris 1992)*, ed. Leonard J. Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich. Septuagint and Cognates Studies; Atlanta, forthcoming.
- Cox, C. "The Use of the Armenian Version for the Textual Criticism of the Septuagint," in *La Septuaginta en la Investigacion Contemporanea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*, ed. N. Fernández Marcos, Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" (Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano" C.S.I.C., 1985): 25-35.
- _____. *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 21; Atlanta, 1986.
- _____. "A Review of Zeytunyan's Edition of Genesis from the Standpoint of Septuagint Criticism," *REArm* 21 (1988-1989): 87-125.

THE ZOHRA BIBLE

- _____. "Armenia," "Eznik," "Mashtots," in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. E. Ferguson (New York/London: Garland, 1990).
- _____. "Text Forms and Stemmatics in the Armenian Text of Job," in *Armenian Texts: Tasks and Tools*, ed. Henning Lehmann and J. J. S. Weitenberg (Acta Jutlandica LXIX:1; Humanities Series 68; Århus: Århus University Press, 1993): 38–43.
- _____. "The Translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion Found in the Margins of Armenian Manuscripts," in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 35–45.
- _____. "Origen's Hexapla and Jerusalem Armenian Manuscript 1925," *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 5 (1991): 49–54.
- _____. Rev. Shahé Ajamian, *Girk' Saghmosats' Davt'i* [Book of the Psalms of David] (Jerusalem: Mount of Olives Armenian Bible Center, 1989) in *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 5 (1991): 192–196.
- _____. "Bible, Armenian," *Modern Encyclopedia of Religions in Russia and the Soviet Union* (Gulf Breeze FL: Academic International Press 1992), vol. 4: 71–75.
- _____. "The Vocabulary for Good and Evil in the Armenian Translation of the New Testament," in *Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, ed. Ajamian and Stone: 57–68.
- _____. "A Reply to A. Zeyt'unyan's Response to 'A Review of Zeyt'unyan's Edition of Genesis from the Standpoint of Septuagint Criticism'," *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 24, forthcoming.
- Drost-Abgarjan, Armenuhi. "Biblisches in moderner armenischer Literatur am Beispiel von Parujr Sewaks "Nimmerverstummender Blockenturm," in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 47–71.
- _____. "Transformation of Some Psalter Motifs in Armenian Hymnography," paper given at the 10th Anniversary Conference of the Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes, University of London, September 1–5, 1993. To be published in the proceedings, by School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- van Esbroeck, Michel. "Une exégèse rare d'Isaïe 29, 11–12 conservée en arménien," in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 73–78.
- Evans, Helen C. "Cilician Manuscripts and their Sources in the Crusaders' Era," paper given at annual meeting of the Society for Armenian Studies, 20–23 November 1986, in Boston.

- Greppin, J. A. C. *Bark Galianosi: A Greek-Armenian Lexicon to Galen*. Delmar NY: Caravan Books, 1985.
- Hannick, Christian. "Der Ausdruck des Reflexivums im Altarmenischen. Eine semantische Studie auf der Grundlage der alten Versionen des Neuen Testaments," paper given at the 4th conference of the Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes, Fribourg, 13–15 October 1988.
- . "Bibelexegese in armenischen Handschriftenkolophonen," in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 79–86.
- Heyer, Friedrich. "Biblische Bezüge in den 95 Elegien des Gregor von Nareg," in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 87–96.
- Jinbachian, Manuel M. "Modern Armenian Translations of the Bible," in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 97–123.
- Jungmann, Paul and J. J. S. Weitenberg. *A Reverse Dictionary of Classical Armenian*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1993.
- Kouymjian, Dickran. "The Evolution of Armenian Gospel Illumination: The Formative Period (9th–11th Centuries), in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 125–142.
- . "Inscribed Armenian Manuscript Bindings: A Preliminary General Survey," in *Armenian Texts Tasks and Tools*, ed. Lehmann and Weitenberg: 101–109.
- . "Armenian Gospel Illumination and the Classical Tradition," in *Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, ed. Ajamian and Stone: 69–86.
- Leloir, Louis. "Le Commentaire d'Ephrem sur le Diatessaron. Quarante-et-un folios retrouvés," *Revue Biblique* 94 (1987): 481–518. Cited: *REArm* 21 (1988–1989) 586.
- . "Eghishē and the Bible: Observations on his Homily on the Transfiguration," *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 5 (1990–1991): 3–21.
- . "Le commentaire d'Éphrem sur le Diatessaron. Réflexions et suggestions," in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. van Belle, J. Verheyden (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 100; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1992), Vol. 3: 2359–2367.
- . "Comment les premiers moines arméniens ont-ils lu la Bible?" in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 143–152.

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

- Lehmann, Henning and J. J. S. Weitenberg, ed. *Armenian Texts Tasks and Tools*. Acta Jutlandica LXIX:1; Humanities Series 68; Åarhus: Åarhus University Press, 1993.
- de Leeuw van Weenen, A. *The Lemmatization of Eusebius [of Emesa]' Commentary on Genesis*. Reports of the Leiden Armenian Data Base No. 2; Leiden University: Department of Comparative Linguistics, 1990. Available for US\$25 from the Department.
- Lipscomb, W. Lowndes. *The Armenian Apocryphal Adam Literature*. University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 8; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990. Publication of the author's 1983 Columbia University doctoral thesis.
- Mathews, Edward. "The Armenian Version of Ephrem's Commentary on Genesis," paper given at the 10th Anniversary Conference of the Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes, University of London, 1-5 September 1993. To be published in the proceedings, by School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Mathews, Thomas F and Avedis K. Sanjian. *Armenian Gospel Iconography: The Tradition of the Glajor Gospel*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1991.
- Merguerian, Barbara J. "The Armenian Bible and the American Missionaries: The First Four Decades (1820-1860), in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 153-169.
- Minassian, Martiros. *Bayakan Lrats'umner grabar Avetarannerum* [The Objects of Verbs in the Armenian Gospels]. Geneva, 1988.
- _____. *Avetaranneri ew Gortsk'i Yatuk Anunneri Ughhagrut'iwně ew Holovumě* [The Orthography and Declension of Proper Nouns in the Gospels and Acts]. Geneva, 1988.
- _____. "Le déterminant *amenayn* dans les évangiles," *Revue des Études Arméniennes* N.S. 21 (1988-1989): 49-86.
- _____. *Gortsk'i ew T'ght'eri Hamabarbarner (Polsakan 1895-i tpagrits')* [Concordances of the Acts and Epistles, according to the 1896 Constantinople edition]. Geneva, 1989.
- _____. *Nor Ktakarani Bnagirě ew Danakan Hayeren*. [The Text of the New Testament and Classical Armenian]. Geneva, 1990.
- _____. *Avetaranneri Liakatar Hamabarbarner*. [Complete Concordance of the Gospels]. Vienna, 1991.
- Mouradian, Parouir. "Importance des citations bibliques rencontrées dans

THE ZOHRAB BIBLE

- les documents littéraires et épigraphiques médiévaux arméniens," in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 171–179.
- Nersessian, V. "Armenian Illuminated Gospels: The Life of Christ," *Society for Armenian Studies Newsletter*, 11, 2 (July 1986): 6–8.
- . *Armenian Illuminated Gospel-Books*. London: The British Library, 1987. Review: D. Kouymjian, *REArm* 21 (1988–1989): 548–550.
- Nersoyan, Hagop J. "The Cross of God: The Religious Philosophy of David the Invincible," in *David Anghat', The 'Invincible' Philosopher*, ed. Avedis K. Sanjian. Studies in Near Eastern Culture and Society 7. Atlanta: Scholars, 1986, pp. 65–79.
- Outtier, Bernard. "Réponses oraculaires dans des manuscrits bibliques caucasiens," in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 181–184.
- Paramelle, Joseph, ed., with the collaboration of E. Lucchesi and J. Sesiano. *Philon d'Alexandrie: Questions sur la Genèse II, 1–7*. Greek text, Armenian version and Latin parallels. Cahiers d'Orientalisme 33; Geneva: Cramer, 1984.
- Renoux, C. *La Chaîne arménienne sur les épîtres catholiques, I. Patrologia Orientalis* 43, fasc. 1 (no. 193); Turnhout: Brepols, 1985. Rev.: R. W. Thomson, *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 8 (1987): 87–88.
- . "David K'obayrec'i ou Hésychius de Jérusalem dans la Chaîne sur Job de Jean Vanakan?" in *Armenian Studies — Études Arméniennes — in Memoriam Haïg Berbérian*, ed. Dickran Kouymjian (Armenian Library of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation; Lisbon: C. Gulbenkian Foundation, 1986): 663–682.
- Sanjian, Avedis K., ed. *David Anghat', The 'Invincible' Philosopher*. Studies in Near Eastern Culture and Society 7. Atlanta: Scholars, 1986. Rev.: Cox, *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 3 (1987): 159–163.
- . "Esayi Nč'ec'i and Biblical Exegesis," in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 185–193.
- Sarkissian, Chahan. "The Commentary on Genesis by Timotheos vardapet, XIth century," paper given at the 10th Anniversary Conference of the Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes, University of London, September 1–5, 1993. To be published in the proceedings, by School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Siebert, Folker, ed. and tr. *Philon von Alexandrien, Über die Gottes-*

bezeichnung "wohltätig verzehrendes Feuer" (De Deo). Retranslation of the fragments from the Armenian, German translation and commentary. Wiss. Untersuchungen zum N.T. 46; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988.

_____. "Literatur zur Erschliessung des armenischen Philon," *Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes Newsletter* 11 (June 1989): 10-16.

_____. "Die rhetorische Qualität der armenischen Bibel," in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 207-211.

Smith, J. Nimmo, ed. *Pseudo-Nonniani in IV orationes Gregorii Nazianzeni commentarii*. With collation of the Syriac by S. Brock and of the Armenian by B. Coulie. *Corpus Christianorum; Series Graeca* 27 = *Corpus Nazianzenum* 2; Turnhout: Brepols, 1992.

Stone, Michael E. "The Armenian Vision of Ezekiel," in *Christians Among Jews and Gentiles: K. Stendahl Festschrift*, ed. G. W. E. Nickelsburg and G. W. MacRae (Philadelphia PA: Fortress Press, 1986): 261-269.

_____. "The Epitome of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, N.S. 20 (1986-1987): 69-107.

_____. "Two Further Notes on the Epitome of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, N.S. 21 (1988-1989): 497-499.

_____. *A Textual Commentary on the Armenian Version of IV Ezra*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 34; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990.

_____. "On Reading and Apocalypse," in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium*, ed. J. J. Collins and J. H. Charlesworth. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series* 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1991.

_____. "Armenian Canon Lists V — Anonymous Texts," *Harvard Theological Review*, 83 (1990): 141-161.

_____. *Commentary on 4 Ezra*. Hermeneia A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis MN: Augsburg/Fortress Press 1990.

_____. "Rapport des Recherches sur la littérature apocryphe arménienne," in *La fable apocryphe 1*, ed. P. Geoltrain, J.-C. Picard and A. Desrumaux. *Apocrypha: le champ des apocryphes* 1; Turnhout: Bre-

- pols, 1990: 303–311.
- _____. *Selected Studies in the Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha, with Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 9; Leiden: E. J. Brill 1991.
- _____. *History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*. Early Judaism and its Literature 3; Atlanta: Scholars, 1992.
- _____. "Variants in Armenian Manuscripts and their Assessment," in *Armenian Texts Tasks and Tools*, ed. Lehmann and Weitenberg: 15–25.
- _____. "Eight Manuscripts of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in *Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, ed. Ajamian and Stone: 87–96.
- _____. *Armenian Apocrypha: Relating to Adam and Eve*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences (in press).
- _____. "A New Edition and Translation of the Questions of Ezra," in *Jonas C. Greenfield Festschrift*, ed. Z. Zevit, M. Sokoloff, et al. (in press).
- Stone, Nira. "The Relationship Between Text and Illustration," in *Armenian Texts Tasks and Tools*, ed. Lehmann and Weitenberg: 92–100.
- Terian, Abraham. *Philonis Alexandrini De Animalibus*. Armenian text with introduction, translation and commentary. *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism; Supplements to Studia Philonica* 1; Chico: Scholars, 1981.
- _____. "The Bible in Verse by Gregory Magistros," in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 213–219.
- Thomson, Robert W. "Aspects of Armenian Biblical Exegesis: Elishe on the Passion," in *Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, ed. Ajamian and Stone: 97–110.
- Weitenberg, J. J. S. and A. de Leeuw van Weenen. *Lemmatized Index of the Armenian Version of Deuteronomy*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 32; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990.
- Weitenberg, J. J. S. *Parallel Aligned Text and Bilingual Concordance of the Armenian and Greek Versions of the Book of Jonah*. Dutch Studies in Armenian Language and Literature 1; Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1992.
- _____. "Aspekte der relativen Chronologie des klassische-armenischen," in *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie*, ed. Beekes, Lubotsky, J. J. S. Weitenberg. Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft; Innsbruck, 1992.

- _____. See Jungmann.
- _____. "On the Interpretation of Postclassical Armenian Linguistic Data," in *Armenian Texts Tasks and Tools*, ed. Lehmann and Weitenberg: 65–74.
- _____. "The Language of Mesrop: L'Arménien pour lui-même?" in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 221–231.
- _____. "Text Chronological Aspects of the Use of the Article -s and -d in Gospel Manuscripts M and E," in Ajamian and Stone, ed., *Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, ed. Ajamian and Stone: 111–130.
- _____. "Middle Armenian," paper given at the 10th Anniversary Conference of the Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes, University of London, 1–5 September 1993. To be published in the proceedings, by School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Zeitounian [or: Zeytunian, Zeytunyan], Andranik, ed. *Girk' Tsndots' K'nnakan Bnagir* [The Book of Genesis. Critical Text.] *Hay Hnaguyn T'argmanakan Houshardzakanner 1* [Ancient Armenian Translated Works 1]; Yerevan: Academy of Sciences 1985.
- _____. "Les divergences des manuscrits grecs et arméniens du "Livre de la Genèse," in *Armenia and the Bible*, ed. C. Burchard: 233–243.
- _____. *Girk' Elits': K'nnakan Bnagir* [The Book of Exodus: Critical Text]. *Hay Hnaguyn T'argmanakan Houshardzakanner* [Ancient Armenian Translated Works]; Yerevan: Academy of Sciences, 1992.
- _____. "Some Principles for the Edition of a Critical Text of the Bible," in *Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, ed. Ajamian and Stone: 131 f.
- _____. "À l'occasion d'une critique de C. Cox," *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 24, forthcoming.

Catalogues of Manuscripts

A useful list of catalogues of manuscripts can be found in *Society for Armenian Studies Newsletter* 14, 2 (December 1989): 14–15. It includes the places from which these catalogues may be purchased.